arXiv:1301.5660v1 [quant-ph] 23 Jan 2013

New symmetry in the Rabi model

Bartłomiej Gardas

Institute of Physics, University of Silesia, PL-40-007 Katowice, Poland

E-mail: `bartek.gardas@gmail.com`

Jerzy Dajka

Institute of Physics, University of Silesia, PL-40-007 Katowice, Poland

E-mail: `jerzy.dajka@us.edu.pl`

Abstract. It is recognized that, apart from the total energy conservation, there is a nonlocal $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry in the Rabi model represented by a generalized parity commuting with the Rabi Hamiltonian. Conditions for the existence of this observable, its form and explicit construction are presented.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz, 03.67.-a

1. Introduction

Symmetry is an equivalence of different physical situations [1]. Such an equivalence manifested in an invariance of a certain set of observables can be formalized in terms of commutation relations between observables and Hamiltonian of the system in question. The existence of conserved quantities, also having no classical counterpart, extends an amount of an information accessible for a given quantum system. In an extreme cases one can meet analytically solvable models such as harmonic oscillator, Jaynes–Cummings model or hydrogen atom. The more symmetries are recognized (together with related conserved quantities) the more knowledge about the system is accessible for the researcher. It is a kind of truism in studies of quantum systems.

In the paper we consider a quantum model consisting of a two–level system (qubit) interacting with a single mode bosonic field (representing *e.g.* electromagnetic radiation) with frequency ω. Hamiltonian for that system is assumed to be

$$\mathbf{H} = \beta\sigma_z + \Delta\sigma_x + \omega a^\dagger a + \sigma_z \otimes \left(g^* a + g a^\dagger\right), \tag{1}$$

where a and $a^\dagger$ are the creation and annihilation operators of the bosonic field *i.e.*, $[a, a^\dagger] = \mathbb{I}$, whereas σ_z and σ_x denote the two of the Pauli spin matrices. The term $\beta\sigma_z$ is an unperturbed energy of the qubit, with possible eigenenergies $\pm\beta$, while $\Delta\sigma_x$ describes a tunneling of the two–level system in the absence the bosonic field (spontaneous transition). Finally, the coupling constant g reflects the strength of the interaction between the systems.

The above Hamiltonian is the well known Rabi model [2, 3]–probably the most influential model describing fully quantized interaction between matter and light. Although, the model originates from quantum optics [4], its applications range form molecular physics [5], solid state (see Refs. in [6]), to the recent experiments involving cavity and circuit QED [7, 8]. This model can be implemented by means of rich variety of different setups such as Josephson junctions [9], trapped ions [10], superconductors [11] or semiconductors [12], to name a few.

Despite simplicity of the model its Hamiltonian (1) cannot be diagonalized exactly when $\Delta \neq 0$. Although, some progress has been reported recently [13, 14], the exact analytical formulas for eigenvalues and eigenfunction are still missing. There is a wide spectrum of available approximation techniques, including RWA [15] (leading to the famous Jaynes–Cummings model [16]), which allow approach the problem from many different directions.

At this point a natural question concerning the existence of any symmetries in this model (and related constants of motion) arises. The presence of a constant of motion within an unsolvable model is not only of great theoretical importance, but also can be applied to build its experimental realization [17]. If $\beta = 0$ the Hamiltonian (1) remains unchanged for $\sigma_z \to -\sigma_z$ and $a \to -a$ (hence $a^\dagger \to -a^\dagger$). The symmetry operator $\mathbf{J_0}$, which generates this transformation (*e.g.* fulfills $[\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{J}_0] = 0$) simply reads $\mathbf{J_0} = \sigma_x \otimes \mathrm{P}$, with $\mathrm{P} = \exp(\mathrm{i}\pi a^\dagger a)$ being the bosonic parity [18]. This is the well known result: Still unsolvable system possesses a symmetry when $\beta = 0$.

On the other hand, when $\beta \neq 0$ one can leave $\mathbf{H}$ unaffected by simultaneously changing $\sigma_z \to -\sigma_z$, $a \to -a$ and in addition $\beta \to -\beta$. This instantly brings a question: How does the corresponding symmetry generator $\mathbf{J}$ looks like? Unfortunately, this question has not been answered so far. Moreover, quite recently it was conjectured [13] that the Rabi model (1) does not posses any symmetry at all (except the trivial one, related to the total energy conservation) as long as $\beta \neq 0$. In other words, it was expected in [13] that the only self–adjoint operator $\mathbf{J}$ such that $[\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{J}] = 0$ is $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{H}$.

On the basis of the results reported here, we prove that this conjecture is not true. We show that in the Rabi model one can find a self–adjoint involution $\mathbf{J}$, that is $\mathbf{J^2} = \mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{B}}$, such that $\mathbf{HJ} = \mathbf{JH}$. We also offer arguments why this constant of motion is so hard to find in practice, in comparison with the case of unbroken $\mathbf{J_0}$ symmetry. Possibilities of the exact diagonalization of (1) are also discussed.

2. Main result

We begin with formal rewriting the Rabi Hamiltonian (1) as a matrix with operator entries:

$$\mathbf{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{H}_+ & \Delta \\ \Delta & \mathrm{H}_- \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathrm{H}_\pm := \omega a^\dagger a \pm \left(g^* a + g a^\dagger\right) \pm \beta. \tag{2}$$

Customary, the parameters Δ and β denote $\Delta\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{B}}$ and $\beta\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{B}}$, respectively and $\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{B}}$ stands for the identity on the bosonic Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}}$.

The matrix representation (2) of the Rabi model is established via natural isomorphism $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}} \sim \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}} \oplus \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}}$. Such an identification is usually invoked in order to simplify purely algebraic calculations [19]. This is not the reason why we use this idea. Instead, we are going to attack the problem in question by using concepts of block operator matrix [20] along with its relation to the operator Riccati equation [21–24].

Before, we need to clarify some technical aspects concerning the matrix (2), such as *e.g.*, its domain $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{H})$, so that it may become meaningful mathematical object. Unfortunately, in many papers addressing physical aspects of the Rabi model this is not a primary issue. It is needless to say, that one cannot then take advantage of very powerful existential mathematical theorems (like *e.g.*, the famous Banach fixed point theorem [25]), simply because is not known whether the premises of these statements are met.

As a first step toward constructing $\mathbf{J}$, we define domains $\mathcal{D}_\pm := \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{H}_\pm)$ on which both operators $\mathrm{H}_\pm$ are self–adjoint. Since the off–diagonal elements of $\mathbf{H}$ are bounded, we conclude that also $\mathbf{H}^* = \mathbf{H}$ on $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{H}) = \mathcal{D}_+ \oplus \mathcal{D}_-$. To end this, a proper definition of creation and annihilation operators is required. Both a and $a^\dagger$ are unbounded [26] and hence the canonical commutation relation can only holds on some (dense) subspace $\mathcal{D}_2$ of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{B}}$. Let us assume that $\mathcal{D}_1$ is a dense set on which both a and $a^\dagger$ are adjoint, that is $(a^\dagger)^* = a$ and $a^* = a^\dagger$. At this stage, the existence of $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_2$ having the desire properties is not obvious. Result of detailed construction given in [27] can be summarized as follows

$$\mathcal{D}_k = \left\{ \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \xi_n |n\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B} : \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n^k |\xi_n|^2 < \infty \right\}, \quad k = 1, 2, \tag{3}$$

where $\{|n\rangle\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is the canonical (orthonormal) basis in $l_2(\sim \mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B})$. This is rather obvious choice since a, $a^\dagger$ and $a^\dagger a$ need to produce normalizable states. Having (3) in place, we define (see also [28, 29])

$$a|\psi\rangle := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{n}\xi_n |n-1\rangle, \quad a^\dagger|\psi\rangle := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{n+1}\xi_n |n+1\rangle, \quad |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_1. \tag{4}$$

From (4) it immediately follows that $a^\dagger|n\rangle = \sqrt{n+1}|n+1\rangle$ and $a|n\rangle = \sqrt{n}|n-1\rangle$. In most textbooks on quantum mechanics the latter relations serve as the very definition of the creation and destruction operators. Technically, this is not a good choice for a definition due to the problem with closeness. This can be overcome by taking closures given by (4) instead.

A very basic result from operator theory (see *e.g.*, Theorem 4.2.7 in [30]) states that if A is closed on $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{A})$ then $\mathrm{A}^*\mathrm{A}$ is a positive self-adjoint operator. Moreover $\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{A}^*\mathrm{A}) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{A})$ is a core of A, that is A is a closure of its restriction $\mathrm{A}_{|\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{A}^*\mathrm{A})}$. Since the operators $\mathrm{H}_\pm$ can also be written as

$$\mathrm{H}_\pm = \omega \left(a \pm \frac{g}{\omega}\right)^* \left(a \pm \frac{g}{\omega}\right) \pm \beta - \frac{|g|^2}{\omega}, \quad \text{on} \quad \mathcal{D}_2, \tag{5}$$

they are both self–adjoint and their common domain $\mathcal{D}_2$ is a core of both a and $a^\dagger$. Therefore, the total Hamiltonian (1) is well defined self–adjoint operator on $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{H}) = \mathcal{D}_2 \oplus \mathcal{D}_2$.

After resolving technical nuances of the Rabi model we introduce quadratic second order operator equation:

$$\Delta \mathrm{X}^2 + \mathrm{X}\mathrm{H}_+ - \mathrm{H}_-\mathrm{X} - \Delta = 0. \tag{6}$$

Within the framework of the operator matrices theory, Eq. (6) is known as the Riccati equation associated with matrix (2). As we will see, most of the relevant problems regarding the Rabi model (1), including possibility of its exact diagonalization, can be reduced to the mathematical questions concerning solvability of this equation.

Because (6) is an operator equation its solution can be understood in either a week or strong sense. There is also a third possibility–an operator solutions [31], which is not discussed in this paper. Let us briefly clarify this notions.

Definition 1. *A bounded operator X_0 on $\mathcal{H}$ is said to be a weak solution to the Riccati equation (6) if*

$$\Delta\langle X_0^2\phi, \psi\rangle + \langle X_0 H_+\phi, \psi\rangle - \langle X_0\phi, H_-\psi\rangle - \Delta\langle\phi, \psi\rangle = 0, \quad \textit{for} \quad |\psi\rangle, |\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_2. \tag{7}$$

A bounded operator X_0 on $\mathcal{H}$ such that $Ran(X_{0|\mathcal{D}_2}) \subset \mathcal{D}_2$ and

$$\Delta X_0^2|\psi\rangle + X_0 H_+|\psi\rangle - H_- X_0|\psi\rangle - \Delta|\psi\rangle = 0, \quad \textit{for} \quad |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_2, \tag{8}$$

is called a strong solution of (6).

Of course, a strong solution is also a week solution. From technical point of view it is often easier to prove the existence of a weak rather than strong solution. However, in quantum mechanics we are usually seeking for strong solutions of operator equations as this is how we are used to equate the operators. Fortunately, this two notions are in fact equivalent [32]. Nevertheless (6) there is no general method allowing to find either its weak or strong solution. For this reason, the following theorem offering criteria of solvability is of great importance for us.

Lemma 1. *Let $H_\pm$ be possibly unbounded self–adjoint operators on domains $\mathcal{D}(H_\pm)$ in separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Also assume $V_1 \neq 0$ and V_2 are bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}$. If the spectra $\sigma(H_\pm)$ are disjoint, i.e.,*

$$d := dist\,(\sigma(H_+), \sigma(H_-)) > 0, \tag{9}$$

and if one imposes the smallness assumption on operators V_1, V_2 of the form

$$\sqrt{\| V_1\| \| V_2\|} < \frac{d}{\pi}, \tag{10}$$

then the Riccati equation

$$X V_1 X + X H_+ - H_- X - V_2 = 0, \tag{11}$$

has a unique weak solution X_0 in the ball

$$\left\{ X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) : \|X\| < \frac{d}{\pi \| V_1\|} \right\}. \tag{12}$$

The weak solution satisfies the estimate

$$\|X_0\| \leq \frac{1}{\|V_2\|} \left(\frac{d}{\pi} - \sqrt{\frac{d^2}{\pi^2} - \| V_1\| \| V_2\|} \right). \tag{13}$$

In particular, if

$$\| V_1\| + \| V_2\| < \frac{2d}{\pi}, \tag{14}$$

then X_0 is a strict contraction, that is, $\|X_0\| < 1$.

An elegant and compact proof of this statement, based on the Banach fixed point theorem, can be found in [31]. Now we can prove our main result. First we show that if exists a solution to (6) then there is also an operator generating symmetry in the system (2). Second, we show that under certain conditions imposed on the parameters α, β, ω Eq. (6) is weakly solvable.

Theorem 1. *Assume there exists a weak (hence strong) solution X_0 to the Riccati equation (6). Then, there is also a self–adjoint involution* $\mathbf{J}$ *such that* $\mathbf{JH} = \mathbf{HJ}$*, where* $\mathbf{H}$ *is given by (2). Moreover, in terms of X_0 the generator of the symmetry* $\mathbf{J}$ *reads*

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{bmatrix} J_0 - 1 & J_0 X_0^* \\ X_0 J_0 & X_0 J_0 X_0^* - 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \textit{where} \quad J_0 = 2(1 + X_0^* X_0)^{-1}. \tag{15}$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0)$ be the graph of X_0, that is

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0) = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} |\psi\rangle \\ \mathrm{X}_0|\psi\rangle \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B} \oplus \mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B} : |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B} \right\}. \tag{16}$$

Since X_0 is a strong solution to (6), $\mathrm{X}_0|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_2$ and $\mathrm{X}_0(\mathrm{H}_+ + \Delta\mathrm{X}_0)|\psi\rangle = (\mathrm{H}_-\mathrm{X}_0 + \Delta)|\psi\rangle$ for $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_2$. Therefore

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{H}_+ & \Delta \\ \Delta & \mathrm{H}_- \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} |\psi\rangle \\ \mathrm{X}_0|\psi\rangle \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (\mathrm{H}_+ + \Delta\mathrm{X}_0)\,|\psi\rangle \\ \mathrm{X}_0\,(\mathrm{H}_+ + \Delta\mathrm{X}_0)\,|\psi\rangle \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0), \tag{17}$$

that is, $\mathbf{H}(\mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0) \cap \mathcal{D}_2) \subset \mathcal{D}_2$. Making use of the same arguments one can verify that $\mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0)^\perp$, which in this case reads

$$\mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0)^\perp = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} -\mathrm{X}_0^*|\psi\rangle \\ |\psi\rangle \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B} \oplus \mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B} : |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B} \right\}, \tag{18}$$

is $\mathbf{H}$–invariant as well. Since X_0 is bounded its graph forms a closed subspace of $\mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B} \oplus \mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B}$ and hence the decomposition $\mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B} \oplus \mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B} = \mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0) \oplus \mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0)^\perp$ holds. Therefore, each state $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{H})$ of the composite system can be uniquely decomposed as $|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi_1\rangle \oplus |\Psi_2\rangle$, where $|\Psi_1\rangle \in \mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0)$ and $\langle\Psi_2|\Psi_1\rangle = 0$.

Let $\mathbf{P}_+$ be the projection onto $\mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0)$, then $\mathbf{P}_+\mathbf{H}|\Psi_1\rangle = \mathbf{H}|\Psi_1\rangle$ and $\mathbf{P}_+\mathbf{H}|\Psi_2\rangle = 0$, thus assuming, for a moment, that $\mathbf{P}_+\mathcal{D}_2 \subset \mathcal{D}_2$ we obtain

$$\mathbf{H}\,(\mathbf{P}_+|\Psi_1\rangle \oplus \mathbf{P}_+|\Psi_2\rangle) = \mathbf{H}|\Psi_1\rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P}_+\,(\mathbf{H}|\Psi_1\rangle \oplus \mathbf{H}|\Psi_2\rangle) = \mathbf{H}|\Psi_1\rangle. \tag{19}$$

Therefore $\mathbf{HP}_+|\Psi\rangle = \mathbf{P}_+\mathbf{H}|\Psi\rangle$, for all $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_2$. The inverse $(1 + \mathrm{X}_0^*\mathrm{X}_0)^{-1}$ exists and it is a bounded self–adjoint operator on $\mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B}$ and therefore $\mathbf{P}_+$ can be expressed as

$$\mathbf{P}_+ = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{J}_0 & \mathrm{J}_0\mathrm{X}_0^* \\ \mathrm{X}_0\mathrm{J}_0 & \mathrm{X}_0\mathrm{J}_0\mathrm{X}_0^* \end{bmatrix}. \tag{20}$$

It is a matter of straightforward calculation to see that (20) indeed projects onto $\mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0)$.

Since $\mathbf{J} = 2\mathbf{P}_+ - \mathbf{1}$ the only question we need to addressed in order to conclude the proof is whether $\mathbf{P}_+|\Psi\rangle$ is again in $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{H})$ for $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{H})$. Because X_0 is weak (and hence strong) solution to Eq. (6) we have $\mathrm{X}_0\mathcal{D}_2 \subset \mathcal{D}_2$ and moreover, for every $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_2$, the function $f(\psi) := \langle \mathrm{H}_+\psi, \mathrm{X}_0^*\phi\rangle$ is continuous on $\mathcal{D}_2$. Indeed, from (7) it follows

$$|f(\psi)| \le M_\phi \|\psi\|, \quad \text{where} \quad M_\phi = \alpha\|\phi\|\|\mathrm{X}_0\|^2 + \|\mathrm{H}_-\phi\|\|\mathrm{X}_0\| + \alpha\|\phi\|. \tag{21}$$

Since f is continuous as just proved we obtain $\mathrm{X}_0^*|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}(\mathrm{H}_+^*) = \mathcal{D}_2$, thus also $\mathrm{X}_0^*\mathcal{D}_2 \subset \mathcal{D}_2$. As a result $\mathrm{J}_0^{-1}\mathcal{D}_2 \subset \mathcal{D}_2$ and because J_0^{-1} is invertible this in fact means $\mathrm{J}_0\mathcal{D}_2 = \mathcal{D}_2$. The latter implies that $\mathbf{P}_+\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{H}) \subset \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{H})$ which concludes the proof. □

Theorem 2. *Let β, ω, $\Delta \neq 0$ and assume the following conditions*

$$\frac{2\beta}{\omega} \neq \mathbb{N} \quad \textit{and} \quad \frac{\Delta}{\beta} > \frac{\pi}{2}. \tag{22}$$

Then there exists a unique weak (hence strong) solution of Eq. (6) such that $\|X_0\| < 1$. Under assumptions (22) the Rabi model (1) has a self–adjoint symmetry given by Eq. (1).

Proof. Since $\mathrm{V}_x = \mathrm{i}(xa^\dagger - x^* a)$ is self–adjoint for $x \in \mathbb{C}$, the unitary Weyl operator $\mathrm{D}_x = \exp(\mathrm{i}\mathrm{V}_x)$ is well defined. Moreover $\mathrm{D}_x^* = \mathrm{D}_{-x}$ and therefore we have the well known result:

$$\mathrm{H}_\pm = \mathrm{D}_{\pm\frac{g}{\omega}} \left(\omega a^\dagger a \pm \beta - \frac{|g|^2}{\omega} \right) \mathrm{D}_{\mp\frac{g}{\omega}}. \tag{23}$$

By virtue of $a^\dagger a|n\rangle = n|n\rangle$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we obtain

$$\sigma(\mathrm{H}_\pm) = \left\{ \omega n \pm \beta - \frac{|g|^2}{\omega} : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} = \omega\mathbb{N} \cup \{\pm\beta\} - \frac{|g|^2}{\omega}. \tag{24}$$

We see that if 2β is not multiple of ω then the distance

$$\mathrm{dist}(\sigma(\mathrm{H}_+), \sigma(\mathrm{H}_-)) = \inf\{|\omega(n-m) + 2\beta| : n, m \in \mathbb{N}\} = 2\beta. \tag{25}$$

and therefore the spectra $\sigma(\mathrm{H}_\pm)$ are disjoint, *i.e.* (9) holds. In addition, both the smallness assumption (10) and (14) imposed on the off-diagonal elements are satisfied as long as $2\Delta > \pi\beta$. Therefore, according to lemma (1) there is exactly one solution X_0 to the Eq. (6) and $\|\mathrm{X}_0\| < 1$.

The second statement of the theorem follows immediately form theorem (1). □

3. Discussion

First let us take a closer look at the $\beta = 0$ case. In this situation the spectra (24) overlap, hence the separability condition (9) is not satisfied. Therefore, one cannot invoke theorem (1) to establish the existence of a solution to (6). However, in this particular case the spectra $\sigma(\mathrm{H}_\pm)$ are identical and $\mathrm{H}_\pm$ can be transformed one into another by the same bosonic parity operator which generates the symmetry $\mathbf{J_0}$. As we shortly see this is not an accidental coincidence as P happens to be a solution to (6). Indeed, first note that

$$\mathrm{P}|\psi\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n \xi_n |n\rangle, \quad \text{with} \quad \xi_n = \langle n|\psi\rangle. \tag{26}$$

This equality can serve as the definition of P.

From (26) it immediately follows that P is bounded and in addition to that also $\mathrm{Ran}(\mathrm{P}_{|\mathcal{D}_2}) \subset \mathcal{D}_2$ (if $n\xi_n$ are square–summable so are $(-1)^n n\xi_n$), which together with Eqs. (4) gives $\mathrm{P}a\mathrm{P} = -a$ as well as $\mathrm{P}a^\dagger\mathrm{P} = -a^\dagger$ and finally it leads to $\mathrm{P}\mathrm{H}_\pm\mathrm{P} = \mathrm{H}_\mp$. Since P is also a self–adjoint involution, it solves (6) as stated. This solution is not unique; indeed, $-\mathrm{P}$ satisfy Eq. (6) as well. In this case the symmetry generator (15) form theorem (1) is equal to $\mathbf{J}_0$ (or $-\mathbf{J}_0$) as one should expect.

If condition (22) are met, in particular for $\beta \neq 0$, the spectra $\mathrm{H}_\pm$ are separated and Eq. (6) possesses exactly one solution which according to (1) corresponds to a symmetry generator $\mathbf{J}$ of the Rabi model. The only problem is that this solution is unknown. However, one can attempt to simplify the problem by putting $\mathrm{X}_0 = \mathrm{Y}_\beta \mathrm{P}$; then

$$\alpha \mathrm{Y}_\beta \mathrm{P} \mathrm{Y}_\beta + [\mathrm{Y}_\beta, \mathrm{H}_+] + 2\beta \mathrm{Y}_\beta - \alpha \mathrm{P} = 0, \tag{27}$$

where we redefined H_+ so that it reads (5) with $\beta = 0$. When $\beta = 0$ this equation becomes trivial and the solution can be retrieved to be $\mathrm{Y}_0 = 1$. On the other hand, as long as $\beta = 0$, under (22), the Eq. (27) satisfies premises of the lemma (1), hence a unique Y_β exists and $\|\mathrm{Y}_\beta\| \leq 1$. Note, if the inverse Y_β^{-1} exists as well then

$$\alpha \mathrm{Y}_\beta^{-1} \mathrm{P} \mathrm{Y}_\beta^{-1} + \left[\mathrm{Y}_\beta^{-1}, \mathrm{H}_+\right] + 2(-\beta) \mathrm{Y}_\beta^{-1} - \alpha \mathrm{P} = 0, \tag{28}$$

and therefore $\mathrm{Y}_{-\beta} = \mathrm{Y}_\beta^{-1}$. Although, we cannot solve this equation either, the latter equality indicates to what class Y_β belongs. One can also verify that operator Y_β is neither self–adjoint nor anti–self–adjoint ($\mathrm{Y}_\beta^* = -\mathrm{Y}_\beta$). Indeed, assuming to the contrary that $\mathrm{Y}_\beta = \mathrm{Y}_\beta^*$ exists, it then would imply the following separation into a self–adjoint and anti–self–adjoin part:

$$\alpha \mathrm{Y}_\beta \mathrm{P} \mathrm{Y}_\beta + 2\beta \mathrm{Y}_\beta - \alpha \mathrm{P} = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad [\mathrm{Y}_\beta, \mathrm{H}_+] = 0. \tag{29}$$

Both this equations can be solved separately, but the solutions does not agree which each other unless $\beta = 0$. Similar arguments shows that the condition $\mathrm{Y}_\beta^* = -\mathrm{Y}_\beta$ necessary leads to $\mathrm{Y}_\beta = 0$ what contradicts (27) even when $\beta = 0$.

The solution to Eq. (6) not only gives rise to the symmetry generator in the Rabi model, but also can, in principle, be explored to obtain its eigenfunctions and corresponding eigenvalues. Let us briefly discuss this concept.

Since both $\mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0)$ and $\mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0)^\perp$ are $\mathbf{H}$–invariant, thus if $|\Psi\rangle$ is an energy eigenstate it follows that either $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0)$ or $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0)^\perp$. We can say even more than that. Namely, let us define, on $\mathcal{D}_2$, closed operators: $\mathrm{Z}_+ = \mathrm{H}_+ + \Delta \mathrm{X}_0$ and $\mathrm{Z}_- = \mathrm{H}_- - \Delta \mathrm{X}_0^*$, then form (17) it follows that for all eigenstates of $\mathbf{H}$ belonging to $\mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0)$

$$|\Psi_\lambda\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} |\psi_\lambda\rangle \\ \mathrm{X}_0|\psi_\lambda\rangle \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathrm{Z}_+|\psi_\lambda\rangle = \lambda|\psi_\lambda\rangle. \tag{30}$$

Using similar arguments one can show that all eigenstates from $\mathcal{G}(\mathrm{X}_0)^\perp$ are of the form

$$|\Phi_\lambda\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} -\mathrm{X}_0^*|\phi_\lambda\rangle \\ |\phi_\lambda\rangle \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathrm{Z}_-|\phi_\lambda\rangle = \lambda|\phi_\lambda\rangle. \tag{31}$$

It can be proven that $\mathrm{Z}_\pm$ are self–adjoint on Hilbert spaces $(\mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B}, \langle(1 + \mathrm{X}_0^*\mathrm{X}_0)\cdot, \cdot\rangle)$ and $(\mathcal{H}_\mathrm{B}, \langle(1 + \mathrm{X}_0\mathrm{X}_0^*)\cdot, \cdot\rangle)$, respectively [20]. Moreover, $\sigma(\mathbf{H}) = \sigma(\mathrm{Z}_+) \cup \sigma(\mathrm{Z}_-)$ and the following similarity relation holds

$$\mathbf{S}^{-1}\begin{bmatrix}\mathrm{H}_+ & \Delta \\ \Delta & \mathrm{H}_-\end{bmatrix}\mathbf{S} = \begin{bmatrix}\mathrm{H}_+ + \Delta\mathrm{X}_0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathrm{H}_- - \Delta\mathrm{X}_0^*\end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{S} = \begin{bmatrix}1 & -\mathrm{X}_0^* \\ \mathrm{X}_0 & 1\end{bmatrix}, \tag{32}$$

extending the notion of parity chains introduced in [13].

4. Summary

We have recognized a novel symmetry in the Rabi model and constructed its generator $\mathbf{J}$. Although, this symmetry is nonlocal, unlike *e.g.* $\mathbf{J}_0 = \sigma_z \otimes e^{\mathrm{i}\pi a^\dagger a}$, it is a self–adjoint involution and therefore can be considered as a generalized parity of the Rabi model. Invoking physical nomenclature, the Rabi model is invariant with respect to this parity or it has an *unbroken* generalized $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry. The latter terminology is often used in a different (local) context when it is stated that $\beta \neq 0$ corresponds to the broken $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry as in this case $[\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{J_0}] \neq \mathbf{0}$. Our aim was to generalize the notion of local parity constructed for total system (combined by parity operators of the individual subsystems: σ_x and $e^{\mathrm{i}\pi a^\dagger a}$) to the nonlocal one for $\beta \neq 0$.

Our results are not of purely existential character. By means of a solution to a quadratic operator equation–the Riccati (operator) equation, we have derived an explicit formula for the symmetry operator $\mathbf{J}$ and formulated conditions (22) (range of parameters) guaranteeing its existence. The question whether symmetries in the Rabi model can exists under conditions other that (22) is a subject of current intensive investigations.

Finding solutions to the Riccati equation can be related to the question concerning solvability (diagonalization) of the Rabi model. This equation offers a 'measure of difficulty' of the original problem. Although, our analysis was mainly focused on the Rabi model, the presented technique can in principle be extended to general two–level open quantum systems.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education under project **Iuventus Plus**, No. 0135/IP3/2011/71 (B. G) and NCN Grant N202 052940 (J. D)

References

References

[1] Peres A 1993 *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, London)

[2] Rabi I I 1936 *Phys. Rev.* **49**(4) 324–328

[3] Rabi I I 1937 *Phys. Rev.* **51**(8) 652–654

[4] Vedral V 2006 *Modern Foundations of Quantum Optics* (Imperial College Press, London)

[5] Thanopulos I, Paspalakis E and Kis Z 2004 *Chemical Physics Letters* **390** 228 – 235 ISSN 0009-2614

[6] Irish E K 2007 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**(17) 173601

[7] Englund D *et al* 2007 *Nature* **440** 857–861

[8] Niemczyk T *et al* 2010 *Nature Physics* **6** 772776

[9] Sornborger A T, Cleland A N and Geller M R 2004 *Phys. Rev.* A **70**(5) 052315

[10] Leibfried D and *et al*B 2003 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**(1) 281–324

[11] Johansson J, Saito S, Meno T and *et al*N 2006 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**(12) 127006

[12] Hennessy K *et al* 2007 *Nature* **445** 896–899

[13] Braak D 2011 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**(10) 100401

[14] Ziegler K 2012 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45** 452001

[15] Albert V V, Scholes G D and Brumer P 2011 *Phys. Rev.* A **84**(4) 042110

[16] Romanelli A 2009 *Phys. Rev.* A **80**(1) 014302

[17] Crespi A, Longhi S and Osellame R 2012 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**(16) 163601

[18] Gardas B 2011 *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **44** 195301

[19] Chen Q H, Wang C, He S, Liu T and Wang K L 2012 *Phys. Rev.* A **86**(2) 023822

[20] Langer H and Tretter C 1998 *J. Operator Theory* **39** 339–359

[21] Egoriv A I 2007 *Riccati Equations* (Pensoft Publishers, Bulgaria)

[22] Gardas B 2010 *J. Math. Phys.* **51** 062103

[23] Gardas B 2011 *J. Math. Phys.* **52** 042104

[24] Gardas B and Puchała Z 2012 *J. Math. Phys.* **53** 012106

[25] Reed M and Simon B 1980 *Method of Modern Mathematical Physics* (Academic Press, Inc. (London) Ltd.)

[26] Szafraniec F H 2000 *Comm. Math. Phys.* **210**(2) 323–334 ISSN 0010-3616

[27] Szafraniec F H 1998 *Contemp. Math.* **212** 269–276

[28] Szafraniec F H 2007 *Rep. Math. Phys.* **59** 401 – 408 ISSN 0034-4877

[29] Szafraniec F H 2001 *J. Phys. A: Math. and Gen.* **34** 10487

[30] Blank J, Exner P and Havliček M 2008 *Hilbert Space Operators in Quantum Physics* (Springer Science+Business Media B.V)

[31] Albeverio S, Makarov K A and Motovilov A K 2003 *Can. J. Math.* **55**(3) 449–503

[32] Albeverio S and Motovilov A K 2011 *Trans. Moscow Math. Soc.* **72** 45–77